Application No. 09/944,785
Attorney Docket No. XPL-003-US
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2004
Page 8 of 12

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are currently pending, all of which have been rejected. In particular, claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brookman (WO 01/067357), claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dunlap et al. (US 6,560,637), claims 5-9 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookman in view of Dunlap, and claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brookman in view of Wong et al. (US 6,708,172). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 10 and 19 are amended by this amendment. Claim 10 is amended to correct a typographical error. The "means for authorizing" element was inadvertently included twice in the claim. The second instance has been deleted to remedy the typographical error. Claim 19 is also amended to correct a typographical error. The word "between" was inadvertently not included in the original claim.

Turning to Brookman, which forms the basis in whole or in part the rejection of all claims except 19-23, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Brookman does not teach an online interactive system for facilitating collaboration between a presenter and a plurality of participants." Rather, as best summarized on page 3, lines 4-9, Brookman discloses a system for conducting polls, rating and categorizing content, and presenting advertisements in an interactive environment. As shown in figures 1-6 of Brookman, questions are posted on a website to which pollsters can then respond with yes/no answers or comments. This is not collaboration, which as shown in the exemplary embodiments of the present invention provides for real-time interaction between a user and presenter.

With respect to claims 1-9, two graphical user interfaces are recited – a presenter graphical user interface and a participant graphical user interface. The distinction between different graphical user interfaces is neither taught nor suggested by Brookman. Thus, it appears that the Examiner is attempting to correlate the author of Brookman to the presenter of the present invention and the polling community of Brookman and the participants of the present invention. While this correlation is unsupported by the disclosure of Brookman and certainly inappropriate under 35 U.S.C. §102, for the sake of argument, a comparison between the graphical user interfaces of

8

Application No. 09/944,785
Attorney Docket No. XPL-003-US
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2004
Page 9 of 12

Brookman and those recited in claims 1-9 demonstrates the failure of Brookman to anticipate these claims.

In Brookman, the author specific web pages are depicted in figures 4, 13-15, 17-22 and the pollster specific web pages are depicted in figures 1-3, 5-6 and 16. Other figures relate to user profiles, registration and other aspects of the system. The patentable distinctions between Brookman and the recited graphical user interfaces abound.

First, Brookman fails to teach a presenter graphical user interface comment text box within which presenter generated comments are displayed. The reason is simple. Brookman does not provide for author comments. By the nature of the Brookman system, an author posts a question and waits for responses/answers from pollsters. That is the extent of the interaction.

In another example, the author specific web pages of Brookman provide for displaying the author's question, but do not display pollster questions, which the Examiner looks to in order to anticipate the question text box of the presenter graphical user interface recited in claim 1. In fact, Brookman does not provide for pollster questions at all. Pollsters are only provided with the options of answering or commenting, not posing questions of their own when interacting with the author.

Additionally, Brookman does not disclose the recited presenter graphical user interface audience text box. While Brookman informs the author of those pollsters responding to the author's question, the author is not presented with a list of each of the pollsters as is apparent from figure 5 of Brookman.

Yet another distinction is the failure of Brookman to teach the means for authorizing recited in claim 1. Even if the Examiner's assumption that a password is a form of authentication is correct, the password is selected by the individual pollster and does not by any stretch of the imagination constitute an authorization granted by the presenter as is recited in claim 1. Of note, the recited means for authorizing is an element of the presenter graphical user interface.

Also lacking in Brookman are both means for posting as recited in claim 1. The author simply generates questions in Brookman and does not generate comments or answers as the author.

An analysis of the recited participant graphical user interface demonstrates

9

Application No. 09/944,785
Attorney Docket No. XPL-003-US
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2004
Page 10 of 12

similar deficiencies in Brookman. For example, Brookman fails to teach a means for requesting authorization, a means for generating a question, a question text box, or an answer text box, since in the Brookman system pollsters respond to questions, they do not pose questions. Brookman also fails to teach a comment text box, since in the Brookman system authors generate only questions, not comments.

These are but examples of the many recited elements that Brookman fails to teach in claims 1-9. With respect to claim 10, the Examiner has rejected the claim on the same rational as claim 1. While the Applicant notes that claims 1 and 10 are separate, distinct and differ in scope, many of the above arguments do apply to claims 10-18. For example, Brookman fails to teach 1) a comment text box as the author in Brookman generate questions not comments, 2) a question text box as pollsters in Brookman do not generate questions, only the author does, 3) an answer text box as in Brookman the author does not respond to questions from pollsters, 4) an audience text box as Brookman only provides a list to the author of the responding pollster not each pollster, and 5) either means for posting as the author simply generates questions in Brookman and does not generate comments or answers as the author.

As for the Examiner's citation to specific text from Brookman with respect to claims 1-18, there appears to be an attempt to mix and match the Brookman web pages regardless of whether the particular web page are those presented to the author or the pollster. There is also a mix and match approach to the creator of questions, answers and comments in Brookman. The disclosure is clear in Brookman that the author poses a question and then over time (not real-time) pollsters provide answers and comments to the question. Such an approach is improper as the relationship between the presenter and participant is affirmatively recited in claims 1-18 and cannot be ignored.

Turning to Dunlap and claims 5-9 and 14-23, Dunlap fails to teach a number of the recited elements. For example, there simply is no means for annotating the converted file (as recited in claims 6, 15 and 20) in the portion of the Dunlap specification cited by the Examiner (col. 7, lines 32-55) nor elsewhere in the specification. The text cited by the Examiner discusses simultaneous presentation of the slide images, not annotation. In Dunlap, the presenter is allowed to control the image files representing the presentation by scrolling backward and forward using the

10

Application No. 09/944,785
Attorney Docket No. XPL-003-US
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2004
Page 11 of 12

"previous slide" control 716 and the "next slide" control 714 on presentation tool bar 710. There is no teaching or suggestion of any mechanism that allows for the annotation of the image files.

Additionally, there simply is no means for allowing the presenter to grant one of the plurality of participants control of the presentation (as recited in claims 9 and 23) in the portion of the Dunlap specification cited by the Examiner (col. 5, lines 45-68; col. 6, lines 1-36) nor elsewhere in the specification. The text cited by the Examiner describes the process of joining as either a presenter or a viewer, not interaction between the presenter and viewer over slide control. With respect to claim 16, which recites means for requesting control of the slide show presentation and means for authorizing control, the claim elements are likewise not found in Dunlap for similar reasons as Dunlap does not provide for a presenter granting control to a viewer.

Turning to Wong and claims 2 and 12, Wong fails to teach the recited elements. As a general note, Wong is directed to a system for a plurality of users. There is no distinction in Wong between users with respect to control of communications. In contrast, these claims distinguish between a presenter who controls the collaboration and the participants in the collaboration as recited in the claims. An analysis of individual claim elements demonstrates further deficiencies in Wong.

With respect to the recited means for selecting a participant from the audience text box for private communication, the text cited by the Examiner (col. 21, lines 13-62) relates to public, not private, communications. As explained in col. 21, lines 49-55 of Wong, "messages sent by a user are broadcast to any other users in that room." This is contrary to the concept of private communication.

With respect to the recited whisper text box in the plurality of participant graphical user interfaces (claim 2 only), the Examiner points to figure 9A of Wong. As explained in col. 25, lines 30-34 of Wong, figure 9A relates to the sending of a "public message," not a private message. Of note, the Examiner did not refer to figure 9J, given that the Examiner has already relied on figure 9J (discussed at col. 26, lines 45-50 of Wong) to teach the whisper text box in the presenter graphical user interface. This presents a "catch-22" predicament for the Examiner as figure 9J may teach one of the whisper boxes or the other, thus leaving an element that is not taught by Wong.

Lastly, the Applicant challenges the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 in that there

11

Application No. 09/944,785
Attorney Docket No. XPL-003-US
Response to Office Action dated August 2, 2004
Page 12 of 12

are no motivation taught in Brookman, Dunlap or Wong to combine Brookman and Dunlap, and Brookman and Wong in the manners asserted by the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable, and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application; the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: November 30, 2004

Mitchell Rosenfeld
Reg. No: 36,258

Correspondence Address:
Capstone Law Group LLP
1810 Gateway Drive, Suite 260
San Mateo, CA 94404
Customer No. 31955
(650) 577-4500

12